DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 337 FL 001 328

By-Young, Francis A.

Educational Exchanges and the National Interest.

American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Mar 69
Note-18p.
Journal Cit-ACLS Newsletter; v20 n2 p1-18 March 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors-Cultural Exchange, *Exchange Programs, *Federal Aid, Federal Programs, Financial Needs, Foreign Policy, Foreign Relations, International Education, *International Programs, Policy Formation, *Program Budgeting, Program Costs, Program Development, *Program Effectiveness, Student Exchange Programs, Teacher Exchange Programs, World Affairs, World Problems
Identifiers-Fulbright Exchange Program, Fulbright Hays Act

Of primary concern in this article are the long range qualitative effects that the recent Congressional cutbacks in appropriations for the 1969 educational and cultural exchange programs will have upon the national interest. Brief introductory sections cite the historical background of the American commitment to these exchanges and the immediate quantitative effects of the cutbacks on the overall program. The major portion of the document examines the effects of the Congressional action in terms of such program purposes and long range national goals made implicit in the 1961 Fulbright-Hays Act as (1) promoting international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement, (2) broadening the base of national decision making, (3) strengthening the nation's capacity to participate in world affairs, (4) humanizing international relations in the interest of peace, (5) contributing to a better understanding between the United States and other countries, and (6) supporting long range foreign policy goals. Also included are suggestions for legitimate reductions in program spending as well as recommendations for budget expansion. For a companion document see FL 001 301. (AF)

ED030337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

From: ACLS Newsletter, Volume XX, Number 2, March 1969.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

FRANCIS A. YOUNG

For the past twenty years Francis A. Young has been associated with the administration of the Fulbright-Hays exchange program. He is presently the Executive Secretary of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons which operates the program under the supervision of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The ACLS is one of the constituent members of the Conference Board. Mr. Young has his doctorate from Harvard, has taught at Harvard, Lehigh, and Columbia, and was Assistant Director of the Boston Museum of Science. Mr. Young will retire from his position as Executive Secretary of the Committee in June.

1. *The American Commitment to Educational and Cultural Exchange*

The concept of educational and cultural exchanges as instruments of national policy has been a relatively recent development. Traditionally, students and scholars went abroad to further their own personal and professional interests, to advance scholarship through an exchange of information and ideas, and to strengthen teaching and research in their specialties. This kind of international intellectual discourse with its emphasis upon learning and human development was highly beneficial, but it was supported mainly by private philanthropy rather than by government subsidy.

After the Second World War educational and cultural exchange programs entered a new era. Governments throughout the world became major sponsors and supporters of exchange programs when it became evident that these programs served vital national interests as well as the traditional aims of scholarship. In the complex and interdependent postwar world, education, especially in its international dimensions, has come to be universally regarded as the mainspring of national development. A close relationship has also developed between education and national security. Whereas the strength and security of nations had for centuries been thought of as a function of military and economic power, it has now become evident—partly as a result of the historic scientific achievement in releasing atomic power, but for other reasons as well—that military and economic power themselves rest upon a scientific, intellectual, and educational base. In a world of ever-widening capacity for atomic destruction, it is realized, too, that a greater political sophistication, a deeper knowledge of other cultures, and a greater will toward peace, on the part of both statesmen and citizens, are necessary to resolve

FL 001 328

international conflicts short of war, or to limit wars once begun. Educational and cultural exchanges, which once were, and still are, justifiable in making the world a better place in which to live, have become indispensable in constructing a world in which it will be possible to live at all.

It was a mark of the vision and leadership of the United States that it set in motion immediately after the Second World War an international exchange program so unprecedented in size and so enlightened in character that it was widely hailed both here and abroad as an historic step forward in the search for a lasting peace. This was the program envisioned in the original Fulbright Act of 1946, aptly described as "the most imaginative piece of legislation of our times." In effect, this Act pledged United States owned foreign currencies in the amount of $140,000,000 from the sale of surplus war equipment for the support of a reciprocal program of educational, scientific, and cultural exchange. The program was designed to secure the social, intellectual, and humane benefits which flow from international education, but with no political strings attached. The Fulbright Program was warmly welcomed abroad and quickly took its place alongside the Marshall Plan and other far-sighted acts of international statesmanship to become a prime source of United States leadership and influence in the postwar world.

2. *Reactions to Cutbacks in Appropriations for Educational Exchange*

The worldwide reaction to recent Congressional cuts in appropriations for educational and cultural exchange programs must be viewed against this background. Moderate reductions in appropriations were expected as a part of the retrenchment policy brought about by the Viet Nam war, but (when the size of the program was reduced by nearly one-half in the last three years), and the 1969 appropriation was slashed by $13,000,000, the severity of the cuts sent shock waves through the academic communities in the United States and abroad. Many in the Congress also spoke out against it, including Congressman John Rooney, Chairman of the House Appropriations Sub-Committee, who stated on the House floor that in his personal view the cut had gone too far.

The 1969 appropriation of $31,000,000 for educational and cultural exchange is the lowest since 1962—a setback of seven years. If one allows for the depreciation in the value of the dollar, the reversal becomes even more severe. In its Sixth Annual Report to the Congress, the Board of Foreign Scholarships wrote:

> In recent years rising costs and reduced budgets have brought about a steady reduction in the number of grants for international educational activities. The appropriation for fiscal 1969 . . . inflicts a drastic cut on these programs. . . . The ironic result of this cut by the Congress . . . is that, as we reach International Education Year in 1970, U. S. expenditures for these purposes (and hence the number of American grantees abroad) will be lower than at any time in recent history.

In its latest Annual Report, the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs writes in a similar vein:

> We spoke in our Fifth Annual Report . . . of the humorless irony in the fact that, as the programs improved . . . and as their effectiveness increased, as more and more top-level ambassadors and others realized the value of educational and cultural relations, and, finally, as the President himself turned his attention to 'international education,' the level of available funds continued to decrease. . . . Dismay and consternation at this last cut in the budget by nearly 28 percent are mild words for the deep emotions and genuine frustration we feel because of our ineffectiveness in convincing the Congress of the importance of these educational and cultural programs.

The reaction overseas to the slash in appropriations was also widespread and deep. This was first reported in detail in the *New York Times* for September 27, 1968. Many members of the overseas binational Commissions (established by diplomatic agreement to administer the exchange programs in the participating countries and composed equally of prominent American and foreign nationals) questioned whether they should continue contributing time and effort to sponsor a program *whose diminished size and funding was so obviously inadequate to its* important objectives. They feared also for their efforts to work out cost-sharing arrangements under which foreign governments shoulder a part of the cost of the program. In submitting its program proposal for 1970-71, the binational Commission in Japan noted:

> with growing alarm the rapid decrease in the amount of money it has been receiving. The 1969 allocation, the smallest in the Commission's seventeen year history, is one-third the amount allocated in 1966. However, the importance of the program, we think, is not decreasing. Insufficient funding causes problems for the future, not the least of which is the question of joint funding by the Government of Japan for which negotiations are presently at an advanced and serious stage. The Commission cannot state too seriously or with greater strength of purpose its request that every effort be made to restore its funding to at least the level of 1966.

The dismay caused by the cutbacks also comes through clearly in the following statement by the binational Foundation in the Philippines:

> As a result of the budget cuts, the American component of the program was practically eliminated, leaving only four out of eleven participants originally scheduled. . . . The adverse affects of these reductions in the promotion of the Foundation's goals and program objectives can be easily imagined.

The Foundation then quotes a recent study of the Philippine program:

> A consensus exists among Filipino officials, academicians, and university students as to the high status, popularity, and objectivity of

the Fulbright Program. . . . The prestige of the program is based upon three factors, namely: first, it is the oldest, continuous foreign scholarship program in the Philippines; second, the Fulbright Program is relatively open in comparison with most other scholarship programs . . . and third, there is a widespread and apparently justified belief among Filipinos that criteria of professional excellence and academic achievement govern the selection of Fulbright grantees.

3. *Effects of the Cutbacks on 1969-70 Programmed Activities*

One can more fully appreciate the harsh effects of the cutbacks on the program in the United States and overseas by noting some comparative figures. The number of grants for American students, teachers, and university professors will drop from the present level of close to 1,600 to an estimated 650 in 1969-70, a decline of approximately 60 percent. Actually the reductions will be even more severe than these figures suggest, since many of the surviving awards will be for shorter periods than the normal full year grant. Awards for foreign students, teachers, and professors for study and teaching in the United States will drop about 30 percent from approximately 4,000 to 2,800. Foreign grantees are less affected, since in cutting the appropriation Congress made clear its intention that the major reductions were to be made in programs sending Americans abroad.

Drastic measures have had to be taken in some countries to cope with the reduction in funds. For example, no new grants of any kind will be available for American students or professors for 1969-70 in the United Kingdom, Norway, Korea, and Singapore, and the numbers will be greatly reduced for other countries except Finland and Ireland, where the programs are largely supported with special funds, and in West Germany, where the German government has continued its large financial contribution and the binational Commission has drawn upon accumulated reserves to keep the program going at close to last year's level. In spite of the fact that the United States owns millions of dollars in non-convertible Indian rupees, the Indian program will be reduced from last year's $1,002,000 to $541,000 in 1969-70. (In making up this sum, three dollars in rupees will be used for every two dollars in U. S. funds.) The reduction means that the administrative staff of the Fulbright-Hays Foundation in India will be cut in half and that instead of the present 54 full-term and 25 short-term American grantees in India the number will drop next year to twelve: seven professors and five graduate students. The decline in Indian grantees coming to the United States will be from 140 to 70.

An analysis by subjects shows that in awards for American professors to lecture overseas, the cutbacks have been greatest in American Literature, American History, Economics and Business Administration, Education, Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering—in that order. Awards in these fields are not being dropped from preference but only because they are the fields in which

most requests for lecturers are received, and they are therefore the ones which must bear the brunt of the cutbacks. They are the subjects most helpful to foreign universities in contributing to national and international development and in giving their students a clearer and more accurate picture of the United States. They are also fields in which the United States is strong and can make a major contribution to education abroad.

Looking at the picture in various countries and regions throughout the world, close to sixty of the lectureships originally programmed for Latin America for 1969-70 have now been eliminated, including one or more in economics, plant breeding, demography, chemistry, statistics, social work, and agriculture—all prime subjects in economic and social development. In Korea, important projects in science education, mass communications, and Teaching of English as a Second Language have been given up. Thailand has had to strike from its program lectureships in business administration, library science, educational broadcasting, and physics—subjects important to the development of this key country in Southeast Asia. In Ghana lectureships in horticulture, biology, and sociology will be lost. Three lectureships in American history or literature in Spanish universities have been cancelled, as have two in Norway, one in Denmark, one in Portugal, and ten in France. France, however, will retain an American presence in its university system in the form of ten United States teaching fellows in American Studies, the remnant of a once great effort leading to the establishment of over 40 chairs or lectureships in American literature in the French universities.

4. *The Implications for the National Interest*

We have cited some of the immediate quantitative effects of the cutbacks upon the overall program, and have emphasized their magnitude. What now can be said about the long range qualitative effects of the cutbacks upon the national interest? Here, we must examine the effects of the cutbacks in terms of program purposes and long range national goals—goals which are clearly stated or are implicit in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange (Fulbright-Hays) Act of 1961 or its legislative history. They can be summarized as follows:

1. Promoting international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement.
2. Broadening the base of national decision making.
3. Strengthening the nation's capacity to participate in world affairs.
4. Humanizing international relations in the interest of peace.
5. Contributing to a better understanding between the United States and other countries.
6. Supporting long range foreign policy goals.

These are matters of great national interest and import. The claims of the educational exchange programs upon the Federal government for support must be made in terms of the programs' contributions to these basic goals.

5. *Promoting International Cooperation for Educational and Cultural Advancement*

A primary aim of the educational exchange program, from the standpoint of both the participating scholars and the United States government, is to promote international cooperation in education and scholarship. Such cooperation is greatly in the national interest. In the first place, the educational, cultural, and scientific world transcends national boundaries, and the quality of teaching and research in American educational institutions will vary with the breadth and vigor of their international interests and activities. Communication is the life blood of scholarship. If we wish to raise the level of the American academic achievement and enhance the prestige of American scholarship abroad, it is essential that American scientists and other scholars have ready access to the major international centers of learning. Communication through the literature of scholarship and through personal correspondence, while meeting the primary need, is not enough; there must also be frequent opportunity for American and foreign scholars to meet and work together under conditions of maximum suggestion and stimulation. A reduction in the number of Fulbright-Hays awards to American students and scholars as great as from 1,600 to 650 will inevitably lower the level of intellectual communication between the United States and other countries, and adversely affect scholarly productivity here and elsewhere. The most immediate and direct loss in terms of the national interest will come from the cut in the number of awards to senior American scholars for advanced research abroad from the former level of 150 per year to scarcely 20 in 1969-70.

It is disconcerting to note that among the research proposals made by American scholars which the program will be unable to support next year for lack of funds are the following: a study of the educational problems of disadvantaged children in Israel and the design of new instructional programs for the disadvantaged; research on the reduction of migration to urban cores in Japan and the spread of economic benefits more evenly between urban and rural areas; a comparative study of group-treatment programs in Swedish and United States correctional institutions; a field study of the internal workings of Japanese industrial firms which make for efficiency in spite of traditional modes of management; the organization and conduct of basic research in mathematics, physics, and biology in French universities; and collaborative research with a British specialist in human cardio-pulmonary physiology and its relation to the treatment of heart disease. The inability of the program to support these and other studies delays the progress of scholarship in areas of great national concern and social importance and reduces the gross national educational product of the country.

ment overseas, especially in the less developed countries. To cite a typical example, preparations are now being made for an eight week seminar in the fall of 1969 on university education and national development for university officials from representative countries in Latin America. This seminar, the ninth in a series conducted under the exchange program, will be sponsored by the University of Kansas in cooperation with the University of Costa Rica and the University of New Mexico. The impact of these seminars on university development in Latin America has been so great that it would be a tragic eventuality if future cuts in appropriations should lead to their discontinuance.

Foreign universities recently established in the newly developing countries are especially dependent upon assistance from the United States and other technically advanced countries. A good example is Haile Selassie I University in Ethiopia. Four American Fulbright professors are now teaching there in American and African literature, law, physics, and zoology. In a recent letter to William O. Hall, the American Ambassador to Ethiopia, Kassa Wolde Mariam, President of Haile Selassie I University, wrote in part:

> This is to reiterate again our hope that we will not lose any of our Fulbright professors at the end of the current year. The tragedy would be all the greater because I believe quite honestly that this year we have the most distinguished and conscientious group of Fulbright teachers that the University has ever enjoyed. . . . I am under the impression that the Fulbright Program in Ethiopia has been one of the most important and noteworthy Fulbright Programs on this continent. It is a resource which is extremely important for the development of the University. We cannot possibly replace any of our Fulbright teachers, who are men holding senior academic positions in the University, with Ethiopian staff at this point. . . .

In the advanced countries, one of the most important services rendered by the program is to provide visiting lecturers in American Literature and American History in response to the frequent requests made by foreign universities. The number of American professors in American studies receiving Fulbright-Hays awards has exceeded 100 annually during the last few years. There can be no doubt that the exchange program has been the principal factor in introducing instruction in these subjects in most of the leading universities throughout the world, including universities in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania. The cancellation of all awards for American professors to lecture next year in the United Kingdom evoked this comment from the head of the American Studies program of the new University of Sussex, England:

> I am dismayed to hear of the cutting down of the Fulbright programme for visiting professors. . . . We have derived such benefits from a regular succession of visiting Americanists that I shudder to think what would happen to our American studies programmes, graduate and undergraduate.

If we view university education in the United States as an input-output system, reductions in the number of foreign scholars coming to the United States for research and teaching affects the country's academic productivity in much the same way as limiting the opportunities of American scholars to do research abroad. Normally, nearly a thousand visiting Fulbright professors work each year in laboratories, libraries, and classrooms throughout the United States. Reports on the work of these visiting scholars reveal their substantial contributions to American education and technology. For example, Dr. J. G. Bouwkamp, Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of California, Berkeley, in reporting on the work of visiting Fulbright scholar Dr. Ugo Vogel of West Germany indicates that he will co-author two reports and one paper on steel technology. In addition he has taught an undergraduate and a graduate course in Steel Design. In the latter case, his European engineering background provided for an interesting change in course emphasis and allowed students to be exposed to the design philosophy of some of the latest foreign developments in this field. Referring to the work of visiting Finnish scholar, Dr. Jaakko Mukula, at the United States Agricultural Research Center in Beltsville, Maryland, Dr. L. L. Danielson, Leader of Weed Investigations, reports that Dr. Mukula has discovered the selective activity of three new chemicals in controlling certain common weeds in leaf and cole crops. Dr. Danielson remarks that the results of Dr. Mukula's research will have a direct bearing on important weed problems in the United States and Finland.

Grants to foreign scholars in the humanities and the social sciences serve the national interest no less than those in the natural and technological sciences. In recent years the exchange program has brought approximately 200 foreign scholars to the United States annually for lecturing and research in area studies, including the teaching of foreign languages. Instruction in all the major foreign languages in American universities benefits from these visiting specialists, who ranged last year from 35 in French language and literature to 2 in Japanese. When many more specialists in Japanese language and literature are needed in American universities, it is ironic that virtually all Fulbright-Hays travel grants for visiting Japanese scholars have been cancelled for 1969-70. In the social sciences also the contributions of visiting Fulbright-Hays scholars frequently bear upon basic American problems. During the present year, for instance, a Swedish specialist will lecture in the United States on criminology and penology, fields in which his own country has pioneered important new developments. A specialist from the United Kingdom will give courses based on British progress in urban development and design. The program thus makes specialists from other countries available for high priority needs in American education without creating a permanent "brain drain," since visiting Fulbright-Hays grantees must return home or to a third country at the expiration of their awards.

At the same time that the exchange program serves United States educational needs, it cooperates in strengthening educational develop-

While few, if any, government officials would deny that the United States and other countries receive great benefits from educational and cultural exchanges, some ask whether, in view of the large number of students and scholars exchanged under non-governmental programs, it is important for the government to support programs of its own. There are a number of important considerations which bear on this point.

In the first place, the government programs stimulate much of the private efforts. By providing travel grants for 824 foreign lecturers and research scholars last year at an average cost of approximately $1,000 per grant (in most cases funded in foreign currency) the United States government helped to elicit approximately $5,000,000 in stipends and maintenance grants for these scholars from American universities and foundations. It is a stubborn skepticism which sees little advantage to the United States in a "multiplier" of this size.

Secondly, a majority of private exchanges are random in character and concentrated at the student level. They are socially valuable in adding to the total national reservoir of trained persons with international experience, but the pattern of private exchanges is only incidentally related to national needs. Government programs, on the other hand, are valuable instruments for achieving national goals. They make it possible for the nation as a whole to respond to pressing international needs, to fill priority requests for specialized manpower from abroad, and to close gaps or correct distortions in exchange patterns in the private sector. In short, while government programs may not involve large numbers, they serve as a vital balance-wheel in this country's over-all educational and cultural relations.

Thirdly, the educational and cultural exchange programs conducted under the Fulbright-Hays Act undergird other United States government operations overseas by pioneering new techniques, strengthening the linguistic base for conducting joint programs, demonstrating the practicability of large-scale projects, and helping to provide a reservoir of experienced personnel on which other programs can draw. In planning and carrying out pilot projects for technical and educational assistance in the less developed countries, in particular, the exchange program has an importance quite out of proportion to its small size. Its advantages are that it operates abroad through permanent binational commissions in which the host countries are equally represented; the visiting Fulbright professor is a volunteer, an unofficial representative who lives on the local economy and works within the established educational structure of the host country; and his presence there can also be justified in terms of educational benefits to the United States. These important elements of reciprocity, binationalism, and intimate relationship to the local educational system make the Fulbright-Hays program highly acceptable in other countries. Representatives of foreign countries have pointed to the binational exchange programs as the most vital link they have with the United States. Because of the high degree of acceptabiilty and popularity of the programs, any substantial reduction

in them lowers American prestige, impairs confidence in United States intentions, and weakens the effectiveness of the more massive and more politically oriented United States technical aid and information programs.

Finally, it should be noted that over the last twenty years, the Fulbright-Hays program has succeeded in building a highly effective worldwide infra-structure for educational cooperation. Firmly based on international agreements, this structure is featured by the binational educational commissions in the cooperating countries and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships in the United States. The latter, composed of leading citizens appointed by the President from private or public life and serving without pay, makes all selections for awards and maintains the integrity of the program. The success of these arrangements has recently led nearly a dozen countries to share in the costs, thus broadening the future financial base of the program and vindicating the farsighted decision of the Congress to start the program in 1946 with American funds. This binational administrative structure not only operates the Fulbright-Hays exchange programs overseas, but provides convenient and dependable bridges for carrying much of the educational, cultural, and intellectual traffic between the United States and other nations, serving the private as well as the public sector. Many of the binational commissions, for example, offer a counselling service for foreign students wishing to study in the United States under private auspices. Others have established free-standing international cultural institutions such as the American Studies Research Centre in Hyderabad, India. The Fulbright-Hays Act in Sections 103 and 105 encourages the binational commissions to play such supplemental roles. It will cause grave anxiety in other countries with respect to the sincerity of the American commitment to international education if we indicate by severely cutting our still modest exchange programs that the United States has lost interest in supporting cooperative arrangements with other countries for mutual educational development, for cultural interchange, and for the cooperative study of common problems.

5. *Broadening the Base of National Decision Making*

The collective judgment of a nation like that of an individual cannot rise above its information source. Whatever our differences on United States policies at particular times and in particular places, we can all agree on the importance of having in the service of the government and on the faculties of our colleges and universities country and area specialists who can view international problems in historical perspective and in their proper cultural contexts. Perhaps we can also agree that no matter how sound the judgments of government leaders may be when deciding fundamental questions of American military involvement abroad, if their decisions are not supported by the judgment of a large majority of the citizens the unity of the country at a time of crisis may be impaired. A greater knowledge and understanding in-depth of other countries, their history, culture, aspirations, and probable reaction to

outside influences and pressures, will not avoid domestic controversy over foreign policy decisions, but it will help the citizenry to debate the issues more intelligently and to reach an effective consensus on the best course of action to pursue. Lacking access to the classified reports available to the government, the general public is heavily dependent upon unofficial sources of information—what they can obtain from each other, especially from those who have been abroad, and from the universities, the public literature, and the press. The educational exchange program is thus an important part of the general public's information gathering network. The quality of the popular judgment, as distinct from the government's and the prospects of achieving a genuine national consensus on critical foreign policy issues depend upon keeping this network functioning.

6. *Strengthening the Nation's Resources for Participating in World Affairs*

The United States census statistics of 1960, supplemented by more recent data, indicate that at any given time approximately one and one-half million Americans are resident abroad. Somewhat more than one-half of these are in the Armed Services, and somewhat less than half are civilians. Employed civilians number approximately 140,000, the majority being in professional, technical, and managerial positions, including over 10,000 Americans serving overseas as foreign service officers or as other United States representatives in bi-lateral activities. The statistics we have on American educational personnel abroad indicate that the number of American students, teachers, professors, and members of the Peace Corps overseas in 1968 was close to 40,000. In this connection, it is imporatant to note that the average length of stay of Americans working abroad is two and one-half years. If we allow for both replenishment and growth, the number of new personnel required to serve the national interest abroad approaches 100,000 a year. The training of so large a corps of Americans for overseas service places a heavy responsibility and burden upon American colleges and universities. The brief and superficial orientation programs of the past are not enough. Furthermore, the faculties of our colleges and universities are becoming increasingly aware of their inadequacies in training others for international service if they have had little or no significant overseas experience themselves. The Fulbright-Hays program is a primary means by which college and university professors gain access to this experience. For instance, over 85 members of the faculty and administrative staff of a leading mid-western state university including the president, the vice president, and the chancellor of the main campus, have been overseas under the Fulbright-Hays or predecessor government programs. The situation is much less satisfactory, however, in the smaller universities and liberal arts colleges, where the percentages of faculty members who have held Fulbright awards are much lower. Since other opportunities for foreign training and experience are few and far between in these institutions, they are especially dependent upon the assistance provided

by the government exchange programs. Indeed, one of the strongest arguments for increased Federal support of the exchange programs is the importance to the national interest of giving more faculty members in the smaller colleges and universities of the United States the foreign experience they must have to teach their students to live in an increasingly interdependent world, and in an increasing number of cases to serve overseas in business, education, and diplomacy.

7. *Humanizing International Relations in the Interest of Peace*

The search for peace, at home and abroad, was a constantly recurring theme in President Nixon's Inaugural Address. "The greatest honor history can bestow," he said, "is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization. . . . We seek an open world —open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people, a world in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation."

In these words the President sensed and responded to the yearning of the masses of people throughout the world for peace. But we must not be surprised if these listeners also ask: "Does the United States really mean what it says?" One test of our sincerity, which the world will doubtless apply, is the national investment we make in the Fulbright-Hays educational exchange program, since this is the one permanent national program which is specifically designed in the words of the enabling legislation: "to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world"—words echoed in President Nixon's speech.

Perhaps one reason why the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of State, the White House, and the Congress have historically provided so little support for the exchange program, not to mention the recent slash in appropriations, is that there is still a widespread belief in government circles, in spite of expressions to the contrary, that the program fails to do its job, that it is a negligible factor in improving the prospects for peace. It is asked in effect: Where are the results? This is a difficult question to handle because one never sees the troubles that are averted; it is the outbreaks which are not prevented which everyone notices.

If this skepticism with respect to the practical value of the exchange program is, in fact, widely shared within the government, it persists in spite of every study undertaken by the government to evaluate the program, including the well-known report made in 1963 by a Commission headed by John Gardner and published under the title of "A Beacon of Hope." It persists also in spite of numerous independent studies by social scientists which outline the achievements of the exchange programs as well as the difficulties which students and scholars encounter in moving from one culture to another. It also pays little heed to the frequent

testimony of American ambassadors on the merits of the program, or to the annual reports of the binational commissions overseas. Furthermore, such a view discounts the fact that over one hundred thousand students, teachers, scholars, specialists, and civic leaders in almost all countries of the world have received Fulbright-Hays awards, comprising an international community of persons with foreign language competence, knowledge of other cultures, and skills in the arts of international cooperation. Most of these former grantees now hold positions in education, mass communications, or public service enabling them to influence the attitude and judgment of millions of their fellow citizens and to exert a stabilizing effect on the delicate balance which sometimes exists between peace and war.

It is this humanizing effect upon international relations which Senator Fulbright referred to in commenting on the Twentieth Anniversary of the Fulbright-Hays program when he said:

> What we can do, largely through the creative power of education, is to expand the boundaries of human wisdom, sympathy and perception. Education is a slow-moving but powerful force. It may not be fast enough or strong enough to save us from catastrophe but it is the strongest force we have available for this purpose, and its proper place, therefore, is not at the periphery but at the center of international relations.

Against the arrogance of political power, Senator Fulbright would interpose the moderating and humanizing power of education.

The logic of history compels nations to make two approaches to peace. One is to maintain the necessary military strength to discourage or repel aggression and to support collective security. The companion approach is to work with other nations to limit armaments, to reduce tensions, to alleviate causes of unrest, to accelerate national development, to improve peace-making machinery, and to promote cooperative economic, educational, and cultural relations and the mutual benefits which flow from them. Both approaches to peace will for the foreseeable future be necessary, but the final object of national policy must be to widen steadily the cooperative approach to peace while striving to reduce dependence upon military power. It is not suggested that the United States cut military expenditures to provide more funds for exchange programs, although, as has been frequently pointed out, the cost of a jet bomber would go a long way, but rather that appropriations for educational exchange and other cooperative programs should be increased by small amounts in order that substantial reductions can eventually be made in the vast military expenditure.

We face, in fact, the prospect of rapidly diminishing returns on larger expenditures for armaments. We are finding out that the military deterrent fails when it has to be used, and once started, hostilities have to be contained lest they escalate to unlimited warfare, bringing in the atomic powers, and eventually leading to mutual self-destruction. The

destructive powers of modern weapons thus forces the belligerents to the conference table and to the solution of disputes by more rational means. We are approaching the time when the strategic limitations inherent in the power to annihilate, on the one hand, and the potentialities inherent in international cooperation, on the other, will lead to revisions in present strategies and expenditures.

8. *Contributing to a Better Understanding between the United States and other Countries*

In its statement of purpose in Section 101, the Fulbright-Hays Act describes one of its aims as "to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange." This aim is sometimes interpreted by persons unduly concerned with short-term fluctuations in the popularity of the United States and its policies to mean "selling" the United States to the rest of the world, or improving the United States image overseas. A careful reading of the Fulbright-Hays Act, and its emphasis upon the term "mutual," shows that the purpose of the program with respect to international understanding is much deeper and more important than day to day "image polishing."

It is, of course, important to the national interest that the United States policy and position on particular international issues at particular times be presented in a favorable light. This important "advocacy" role is a function of the country's diplomatic and information services and should be carefully distinguished from the long range goal of presenting the American experience and achievement objectively to an appraising world, and conversely of providing opportunities for other countries to describe and interpret their achievements to us. This long range aim of the exchange program is based on three convictions: First, the search for truth is a common concern of all mankind. Second, the history and achievements of the American people, while imperfect in many respects, are sufficiently creditable when viewed against the over-all human record for us to present them without bias or defensiveness (which is one of the highest tributes we can pay our country). Third, a fuller, fairer, and more realistic understanding by the peoples of the world of their respective histories, cultures, resources, motivations, aspirations, problems, and achievements will not only broaden their collective experience and lower cultural barriers, but will help to avoid miscalculations in their political relations and to increase the possibility of cooperative action in economic, cultural, and political fields.

It seems hardly necessary to press the point that progress along these lines would be greatly in the national interest, since a more stable, prosperous, and cooperative world community is one way of defining the national interest. But how well does the educational exchange program serve this national goal?

The experience of Dr. Roland T. Ely, Associate Professor of History in Northern Illinois University, who served as a visiting Fulbright-Hays

professor at the University of Buenos Aires (enrollment approximately 95,000) in 1965 and 1966, offers a convincing example of how well the program serves the national interest in promoting international understanding. The main element in the story can be condensed into a few paragraphs.

Students at Latin America's largest university had no chance to study United States history for over 140 years until the University of Buenos Aires invited Dr. Ely, then a professor at Rutgers, The State University, in New Jersey, to come to Buenos Aires for a year as a visiting Fulbright professor. Arriving in March 1965, his immediate mission was to organize and teach the first formal courses and seminars in United States history ever afforded at any Argentine university by an American instructor. Without prompt and generous support from the binational Fulbright Commission in Argentina, this remarkable opportunity would have been lost—perhaps forever—since neither Rutgers nor the University of Buenos Aires was in a position to finance the project. Furthermore, it was clearly desirable to have binational sponsorship at the start. As it turned out, Dr. Ely stayed on for a third semester to consolidate the program. The History Department officially incorporated courses in American studies into the curriculum of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters (Resolution 4040 28 December 1965) and recognized them for credit in studying for the *licenciatura* (roughly comparable to an M.A. in the United States). Then in August 1966 both the Institutes of Argentine History and Argentine Literature, the University of Buenos Aires' oldest and most respected research centers, jointly sponsored a two-day seminar on the history and literature of the United States and Argentina.

Subsequently, two "alumni" of the North American Studies program were asked to teach a course in United States history at El Salvador, one of the two Catholic universities in Buenos Aires. One of the instructors received a Fulbright-Hays award in 1967 to obtain his Master's degree in United States history at St. Louis University. He is now at Northern Illinois University as a graduate Assistant in Dr. Ely's department, where he expects to complete requirements for the Ph.D. degree. He will ultimately go back to Argentina as its first professionally trained United States historian and join the History Department and Institute of Argentine History at the University of Buenos Aires. In time, the North American Studies program in Argentina will no longer need transfusions from the Fulbright-Hays program. Nor will it depend upon the availability of those relatively few American professors who are sufficiently fluent in Spanish to teach United States history at Latin American universities.

Another aspect of the North American Studies program in Buenos Aires merits special note because of its emphasis upon *mutual* understanding, the crucial and distinctive element in the Fulbright-Hays program. The success of the annual two-day seminar on United States and Argentine history and literature has astonished most observers.

Beginning under seemingly impossible handicaps, just after a new federal government had closed the University of Buenos Aires in an atmosphere of mounting tensions, the seminar has now reached a plane which transcends political and ideological differences. This point was underscored in the central theme of the Third Seminar: "Conflicting Situations in the United States and Argentina in the Period between 1900 and 1930."

Sixty-two Argentine professors of history and literature participated in the 1968 seminar. Perhaps even more significant was the Third Seminar's unanimous ratification of a proposal which would have been inconceivable five years ago—namely, to establish an Argentine Association of American Studies. One of its chief goals will be to promote the study of North American history and literature in Argentine universities and, likewise, Argentine history and literature in the United States. Here is a cultural Alliance for Progress already beginning to pay dividends in the form of better inter-American rapport.

Dr. Ely sums up his experiences in lecturing at more than thirty Latin American institutions since 1959 in the following words:

> All too many of the United States' cultural contacts with other parts of the world remain superficial at best. Photographs of our motion-picture-stars—and occasionally souvenirs of our statesmen, such as General Eisenhower and, more recently, the martyred Kennedy brothers—adorn innumerable newsstands and gift shops abroad. On the other hand, how many individuals understand the nation which produced those persons whose likenesses are bought and sold so casually? It would appear both logical and prudent for peoples of the world to become better acquainted with each other through the insight which can only be gained by objective study of their varied histories and cultures. No better weapon exists to attack prejudice, misunderstanding, and similar invisible barriers of the mind. During the last two decades, Fulbright-Hays programs have probably done more than most other efforts combined to help the rest of the world to understand and appreciate the American nation.

And, it should be added, to help the United States better understand and appreciate other nations of the world.

9. *Supporting Long Range Foreign Policy Goals*

There can be no argument that the Fulbright-Hays program is closely related to foreign policy broadly defined, and that this relationship provides the principal basis for government support. The legislation is quite clear on this point. The sub-title of the Fulbright-Hays Act reads: "To provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges." Educational exchanges yield many benefits, but the Act empha-

sizes that it is principally through their influence on the country's international relations that they serve the national interest.

Difficulties arise, however, because the true nature of the relationship between educational exchanges and foreign policy is frequently misunderstood. There is a tendency to think of the exchange program as following in the wake of previous foreign policy action, backing up positions already taken, and helping the United States gain the ascendancy in ideological conflict situations. This is what is often meant when the exchange programs are referred to as "an arm of foreign policy." There are, to be sure, certain senses in which this is true. Educational exchanges at the professorial vice professional level, for example, are an important means of educational and technical assistance, and thus they support an important foreign policy objective with reference to the less developed countries. But even here the main instruments of foreign aid are the university contracts of AID. The basic functions of educational exchanges from a foreign policy standpoint are to broaden the base of relationships with other countries, reduce tensions, lessen misunderstandings, and demonstrate the possibilities and values of cooperative action. In short, educational exchanges pave the way for closer and more fruitful political relations. Rather than following political diplomacy, educational diplomacy normally precedes or keeps step with it, opening up and nourishing new possibilities for international cooperation. Perhaps one reason we have not supported the exchange program more generously is that we have expected the wrong things of it, have assigned it a short range, foreign policy back-up role, and then wondered why it did not produce the hoped for results. Were we to see educational exchanges in their proper relationship to foreign policy—as extending the range of diplomacy, improving the climate in which it functions, and placing it on a firmer information base—we would recognize the importance of the Fulbright-Hays program more fully, use it to better advantage, and support it more generously.

There is another and perhaps even more important link between educational exchange and foreign policy. As service to the government is a proper aim of education, so service to education is a proper aim of government. Education is not only an instrument by which other goods are obtained; it is, in the sense of human growth and development, a good in itself—one of the end purposes of life—whose availability is a hallmark of an enlightened society. International education is not a new kind of education which has yet to prove itself; it is simply an extension of traditional education to the larger parameters of modern life. All the arguments for Federal support of domestic education apply to education in its international dimensions. In this sense, it should be the aim of foreign policy to promote educational and cultural exchanges for their own sake as well as for their diplomatic values.

In the long run, the chief limit on the growth of government exchange programs will not be financial but the availability of personnel of the needed qualifications. At what level of financial support these manpower

limits would be reached it is impossible to say, but the experience of the writer, who has been closely associated with the administration of the Fulbright-Hays program during its more than twenty years of existence, suggests that it could be doubled in size—that is, funded at double the normal level of $50,000,000 a year—without risk of exhausting its sources of qualified manpower. This would raise the exchange program to approximately the same budgetary level as the Peace Corps and to little more than half of the level at which the United States Information Agency is funded—except that much of the cost could be paid for in government-owned foreign currency and in contributions from foreign governments and the private sector. In terms of return on investment (in educational benefits, strengthened relations with other countries, and greater prospects for peace) such a step offers the Administration and the Congress an unparalleled opportunity to serve the national interest.